

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Application pending for entry as second-class matter, at the Post Office, New York City

VOL I

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 21, 1907

No 11

In the present issue appears a review of Professor D'Ooge's book on Latin composition, by Mr. Inglis of the Horace Mann High School, together with a rejoinder by Professor D'Ooge. In printing both the criticism and the rejoinder side by side, I take the occasion to explain to our readers the policy of The Classical Weekly with regard to reviews.

Publication is a sign of life, and often a sign of healthy life, but no one can keep up with everything that appears in the classical field, and it is the bounden duty of a periodical such as this to save the time of teachers by giving as complete an account as possible of the books that fall within our view. To do this it is desirable to secure for critics those who are experts, either by long experience in teaching, or by special study of the particular subject. Perhaps it is the fault of human nature that this very study or experience tends to make us intolerant of efforts which do not harmonize with our own opinions. *Odium philologicum* has been the badge of all our tribe for many years. Nowadays there is much less of it displayed in criticism than ever before, and there seems to be no reason why it should not disappear altogether.

The review and the reply in this issue are good examples of attack and defense on the part of scholars who with firm convictions of their own recognize the sincerity and thoroughness of their adversaries. Mr. Inglis does not believe that the best results can be obtained from writing exercises based upon the text read. Mr. D'Ooge believes the contrary. Personally I am inclined to think that Mr. Bennett understated rather than overstated the arguments in opposition to Mr. D'Ooge's position. I am unable to see how Latin composition has any defense unless it conduces to one of two things, either to a ready handling of the language as a medium of expression, or to a systematic study of syntax. I have yet to find any teacher enthusiastic enough to maintain the former, though I myself do not see why it should not be maintained. If, then, Latin prose composition is taught for the latter reason, it would appear to the untutored mind self-evident that systematic teaching is impossible if the exercises are closely based on

the passages read. I say 'untutored' because I have not yet penetrated into the mysteries of composition books of this sort. I only know that the results so far as entrance examinations are concerned are not thoroughly satisfactory. I should like, therefore, to hear from Professor D'Ooge again and at length in a defense which actually defends the theory which he holds so strongly.

Meanwhile The Classical Weekly is convinced that every writer of a text-book should be credited with the intent to put into that text-book his best work, and the best results of his experience. Such a man deserves courteous treatment. We may disagree with him and we may find many flaws in his work, but, in justice to him, we are bound to admit the sincerity of his efforts. We have deemed it best, therefore, in all those cases where a review takes issue with the fundamental principles underlying the preparation of the book in question, that the author should be invited to set forth his views in the same issue. We hope thereby to bring about not merely a criticism and a defense of individual matters, but a contribution to the discussion of the whole subject that will be valuable to all who are engaged in teaching.

Mr. W. H. S. Jones, in *The Teaching of Latin* (London, 1906), page 29, says a few words on the beginner's work in Latin which have no doubt been duly remarked by Professor Bennett.

"The lessons with beginners should be for the most part *viva voce*. The amount of time that can be saved by using the spoken speech for grammatical drill is very considerable, and there is the additional advantage of making Latin appear like a living tongue. The benefits arising from the use of *viva voce* methods will be increased if the reformed pronunciation be adopted. If used from the first boys experience no difficulty in it. The kinship between Latin and French is more easily appreciated if the original pronunciation be restored. Later on, when the poets are being read, the rhythm is more readily felt. Besides this, the pronunciation being practically phonetic, the use of *viva voce* methods is facilitated, and much needless writing saved. Before adopting the revised pronunciation

the present writer often saw in written exercises *paenae* for *paene*, obviously the result of the difficulty of discriminating between *ae* and *e* when pronounced nearly alike. When *ae* is pronounced like the diphthongal *i*, such a mistake becomes impossible. Quantity, both visible and 'hidden', should be carefully marked in pronunciation from the first. If a boy never hears a false quantity he will not be tempted to make one. Some boys may turn out classical scholars and an accurate knowledge of quantity will be essential for them. How can a boy appreciate the sound of Latin verse, much less write verses himself, when he is taught to say *bōnus, milēs*? Books for beginners should have all the naturally long vowels marked. The pupil will then clearly understand that all other vowels are short, and the mark for a short vowel becomes a superfluity. American teachers generally adopt this plan; it has not yet found favour in England, although recommended by Professor Postgate. No time is lost by attending to quantity early. It is as easy to learn a correct pronunciation as an incorrect one, if only the former is taught from the first.

Mr. Jones has not yet learned "that the introduction of the Roman pronunciation (in America) was a fundamental blunder, and that its retention is likewise a serious mistake"; that "it is extremely difficult, brings no compensating advantages" but "does bring certain distinct disadvantages". Deluded man! Or was Mr. Bennett really the deluded one?

SOME SUGGESTIONS AS TO LATIN STUDY

The articles touching upon Latin teaching in the first number of *The Classical Weekly* interested me so much that I want to set forth a few ideas of my own on the subject. I do it with a certain diffidence because so many years have gone by since I myself taught Latin, but my love for the language and my belief in its educational value have in no way diminished, and I hope what I have to say may not be without interest to the readers of *The Classical Weekly*.

It seems to me, in the first place, that many classical teachers both in schools and in the universities have not as clear an idea as they ought of what they desire to accomplish in their Latin teaching. What do we study Latin for in these days, and what sort of knowledge of the language shall we aim at acquiring? Surely the view promulgated some years ago by a distinguished professor, that "the only rational justification of the study of Latin in our secondary schools" is "to be found in its unique effect in stimulating and elevating the pupil's intellectual processes, and most of all in the increased mastery of the resources of the mother tongue which

it confers", disregards one very important—to my mind the most important—part of the value of Latin study, and when the learned sponsor of the view referred to adds that the only thing which can make the study thus effective in his sense is "careful daily translation under wise guidance", accompanied by "a severe and laborious comparison of the value of alternative English words, phrases, and sentences", and, above all, by "a painfully thorough grammatical discipline", he seems to me not only to exaggerate the value both of translation and of grammatical drill, but also to paint the study of Latin in unduly somber and repellent colors from the pupil's point of view.

The educational value of Latin as mere mental discipline, though higher than that of any other language and quite high enough, I think, to justify the amount of time allotted to Latin, is still a thing shared by various other branches of study, scientific or mathematical, while language study has a special value of its own as the means of attaining the deepest, truest, and most complete appreciation of the life and thought of the people whose native tongue the given language is, and Latin possesses this value to a degree as much greater than any other tongue as the debt of our civilization is greater to the Romans than to any other people. I make no exception of the Greeks because their influence upon the modern world was so largely exerted through the Romans.

If my reasoning is sound, our ultimate aim in learning or teaching Latin should be, as with a modern language, the acquisition of as nearly as possible the same mastery of it as we have of our own language. The power to think in the foreign language is the first essential of such a mastery, and this power can only come from the initiative of the learner; it can no more be directly imparted to him by a teacher through "a painfully thorough grammatical discipline" or by any other process than one can make a rose bush bloom by wiring buds to its branches. Least of all can it come from "careful (and elegant) daily translation". Translation is, of course, a profitable exercise, but so long as the learner needs the words of his native speech as a bridge between his thought and the thought expressed in a foreign language, and so long as his mind retains even the shadow of a half-conscious feeling that the thing called *cheval* by the French and *equos* by the Romans is in reality a *horse* labelled with a queer name, so long as one cannot get rid of the natural enough sense of greater substantiality, so to speak, in the word *horse* than in the words *cheval*, *pferd*, *equos*, ἵππος, and what not, one has acquired no real power of thinking in the foreign language. Not everybody is capable of this highest intellectual activity in the sphere of

language, but the attempt rationally made to reach it is, it seems to me, the most profitable kind of language study.

In the case of Latin there are special difficulties. One is, or at all events used to be—I hope and am inclined to believe that the situation has improved in this respect—that many of our teachers unfortunately did not themselves have that intimate grasp of Latin as Latin which I have described. Too often, in order to gain a clear idea of a complicated Latin passage, they had to *translate* it to themselves. Another difficulty is that the Roman habit of mind was so different from ours that Latin words, except in the case of simple concrete things or simple acts, seldom coincide exactly in meaning with English words belonging to the same parts of speech. This is one chief reason why continual painstaking translation is so much less effective as a means of achieving a working knowledge of Latin than such translation is of acquiring a like knowledge of French or German or Italian, for instance. In any civilized modern foreign language the pupil can generally get from his dictionary a verb or noun or adjective with which to translate a given verb or noun or adjective respectively into English or vice versa well enough to cause not only himself but his teacher, who knows both languages, to suppose that the pupil understands the thing said, even when he may not have, and I am afraid often does not have, a quite clear notion of it even as expressed in his native language. You cannot do that in the case of Latin. What can you do? Practice in comparing “the value of alternative English words, phrases, and sentences” seems to me pretty ineffective—at least until much progress has been made otherwise—because it presupposes that the pupil knows somehow already what the meaning of the Latin is and is casting about for its best form of English expression. But how are we to get at this Latin meaning itself? Most simple words, especially in such early languages as Latin, originally designated simple objects in the physical world or simple physical acts or qualities. I would have the pupil first learn these simple meanings thoroughly, beginning with the words he will meet most frequently in his reading, and then trace the development of the words into representatives of kindred meanings or deflected meanings, so that when he comes to read connected sentences and finds a familiar looking word the meaning of which is not immediately clear to him, his first thought shall be to try to derive from its original meaning a meaning that makes sense with the words of the sentence already understood, instead of looking into the dictionary or elsewhere for some random English word set down among others as one of the labels of his Latin word. This

is a very different process from making up your mind somehow what a sentence means or ought to mean, and then forcing the words into that meaning. Perhaps it may seem a hard process and one lacking in interest to a young pupil, but I feel confident that it can be made both more interesting and easier than the usual processes to the average beginner in Latin. Something of the need of it is hinted at and illustrated with the words *petere*, *ponere consilium* and others by Miss Ella Catherine Greene in her admirable article in the first number of *The Classical Weekly*.

Much more profitable to the pupil also than translating Latin into English, especially in the early stages of his study, is the translation of English into Latin and most of all the writing down in Latin his thoughts, however crude, about the things he sees around him and the events of his young experience or observation. And here, while not encouraging unclassical and made-up Latin, I would not have the teacher insist overmuch upon the use of the words of the Golden Age only, provided the syntax and general structure of the pupils' efforts are those of real Latin. Such practice greatly reduces the amount of formal drilling in grammar necessary for the management of even simple Latin, and I believe that both time and energy would be saved if the hours given to Latin were more equally divided between writing Latin and translating.

I am reminded of a specially important point by a quotation from a textbook in a review full of good sense by Mr. John Edmund Barss in this same first number of *The Classical Weekly*. He says that the statement that “The unit in language is the sentence” expresses “an important truth” but “ignores the fact that the idea of units as applied to language is one not easily gained by a child”. It seems to me that whatever theoretical value the truth thus set forth has the uselessness of the dictum is not so much due to a failure on the part of the child to understand the application of the term “units” as to his tendency to regard the individual words as units strung along in the sentence like beads on a cord, when for practical purposes, in Latin at least, it is the phrases and subordinate clauses which are the real units in the relations of the parts of the sentence to the sentence as a whole. I used to find that when my pupils had learned to consider not only the subordinate clauses but also phrases like the combination of a noun with a genitive or a qualifying adjective or of a noun with a participle in the ablative absolute as the units of which the sentence might be said to be composed they found it distinctly easier to manage the sentence intelligently. This was notably the case in regard to the order of the words. Latin periods, much more than most English sentences, present a

series of pictures to the imagination, words in Latin are more used metaphorically with a vividness undiminished by age or through wandering too far from their original meanings, and the perspective of these pictures becomes much clearer when one looks at the phrases and clauses which constitute them separately as complete pictorial entities in which the most prominent object always occupies the foreground and the others recede in proportion to their lesser importance. For this is the principle of Latin word-order, scarcely affected by considerations of syntax or other extraneous things.

It is a great pity that the writings of the Romans which have come down to us are so exclusively of a kind that appeals to mature minds only, and this fact makes the task of the Latin teacher exceptionally difficult, but I cannot help believing that the process of acquiring as good a mastery of the language as possible along some such lines as I have urged is not only better training for the pupil's mind as such but also more likely to fit him to read and enjoy Latin literature when he reaches greater mental development than is the attempt to pump that literature into him prematurely through the traditional amount of formal grammatical drill and Latin passages done into so-called English.

HENRY PREBLE

REVIEWS

Latin Composition For Secondary Schools. By Benjamin L. D'Ooge. New York: Ginn and Co. (1904). Pp. vi + 131 + 190. \$1.00.

In this book an attempt is made to add a systematic treatment of grammar to the advantages of composition work which is based for content and vocabulary directly on the texts read. Those teachers, therefore, who believe in basing the composition work directly on the text read will find in this book several features of value. Specific grammatical references are given, the explanations are clear though sometimes too comprehensive for school use, and the lists of idioms and phrases should prove advantageous. Those teachers who do not believe in basing the composition work directly on the text read will find in part the same objections to this book as to all other books which are based on that theory. Here, as in other books of this sort, we find the same haphazard, hit-or-miss development (or non-development) of vocabulary which results from the theory that a student can acquire a proper knowledge of words from their occasional occurrence in the texts or exercises without definite assignment. The book contains no vocabularies, special or general, except for Part III.

Nor have all of the difficulties of grammatical treatment been met, for throughout the book grammatical constructions are constantly anticipated and

assumed as familiar to the student before the subjects involved are treated. Section 109 in Part I comprises nine sentences of which eight involve purpose or result phrases or clauses, although these subjects are not treated until sections 117 ff. In section 81 one-third of the sentences contain prohibitions, a subject which is treated in section 99. Section 22 contains a sentence requiring *persuadeo* with indirect discourse. Difficult constructions of noun syntax are constantly employed everywhere, though the treatment of noun syntax begins only with Lesson LXXXVII, e. g. *calamitatis reminisci* (62); *magno usui esse* (319); *Gallia Romanis interdicere* (182); *proelio supersedere* (220), etc.

The order of treatment of the principles of grammar, especially in Part I, would seem very faulty in some respects. No syntax of nouns is treated until Lesson LXXXVII and it is even intimated in the introduction that the treatment of noun constructions may well be deferred until Part II is taken up in the Cicero year. Many teachers will seriously question the wisdom of teaching, during the year when Caesar is read, such subjects as the following: Potential Subjunctive, Lesson XXII, (B. G. I 21); Proviso, Lesson LX (B. G. II 25); Rhetorical Questions, Lesson XXI (B. G. I 20); Optative Subjunctive, Lesson XX (B. G. I 18); Conditional Sentences, Lessons LIII-LVII (B. G. II 11-19); Conditional Sentences in Indirect Discourse, Lessons LXV-LXIX (B. G. II 31-III 5). Of these usages the first four do not occur in Caesar. Such independent conditions as occur (three instances in books I-IV) are all in the indicative and require no explanations. Subordinate conditions are entirely too difficult for students at this period and can all be explained for the time being on the basis of sequence of tenses and attraction.

In many cases throughout the book, but particularly in Part I, the exercises follow the text to which the student is referred too closely. In some cases whole lines may be copied directly from the text. Cf. Part I, sections 25, 157.

Part I contains one hundred and ten exercises, approximately one exercise for each chapter of Caesar, and it is suggested in the introduction that "they can be used most easily and profitably in connection with each day's review lesson". This would seem to involve the problem of time in most schools, especially when we find, for example, in Lesson XCII that the student is expected to learn all the constructions of the genitive with verbs and to prepare eleven sentences in connection with his day's work in Caesar. So also with Lesson LXXXIX, which has eight references and twelve sentences. Nine lessons are starred for possible omission and it is suggested in the introduction that Lessons

LXXXVII-CX on noun constructions may be omitted if necessary. If these directions are followed it would seem that much of the advantage claimed for the 'based on text' method must be lost. Certainly the vocabulary of the student must suffer.

Part II is by far the best part of the book; the latter portion of it, which treats of auxiliary verbs and prepositions, is particularly good.

Part III is based on Cicero's *Pro Murena*, *In Verrem*, and *Epistulae*. Just why these selections should be employed is not clear, for, notwithstanding the statement in the Introduction, the vocabulary is unfamiliar to the student and a fairly large percentage of the words used do not belong to a school vocabulary. References are made to a set of grammatical references in the back of the book which in turn refer the student to his grammar. There are on an average sixteen of these references to each exercise not counting the footnotes, which average twelve, and Lesson VIII caps the climax with forty-one grammatical references and thirteen footnotes.

HORACE MANN HIGH SCHOOL. ALEXANDER J. INGLIS.

The editors of *The Classical Weekly* have kindly given me permission to reply to the above review. While I greatly appreciate the courtesy, I hardly feel that a book needs vindication which has been before the public three years and has won the unqualified endorsement of hundreds of experienced teachers. Two influences have apparently conspired to prevent the reviewer from being as fair-minded as he doubtless wished to be: first, his well-known hostility to the method known as "writing Latin based on the text"; second, his different conception of the object of Latin composition teaching in secondary schools. As to the second of these points, I hold that in addition to a systematic and thorough study of syntax the Latin composition should assist the young student in interpreting the author he is reading. In accordance with this belief the vocabulary chosen in the exercises is that most directly necessary to the translation of his lesson from day to day—which seems to me quite the opposite of "hit-or-miss" and "haphazard"—and the syntax involved includes some of the difficult constructions as they occur in the text before they are formally treated in the lessons. In no case, I believe, has a difficult construction been anticipated, unless its presence in the text justifies its appearance in the parallel exercise. Its obvious value to the student at this point needs no defense. He gets the help he needs at the time he needs it. The reviewer, too, seems to ignore the fact that the student has studied Latin a year or more before taking up Caesar and is undoubtedly familiar with some of the fundamental constructions in their simplest form. For example,

in teaching sequence of tenses (Part I, § 10) it is assumed that the student knows something about the subjunctive of purpose and of result, but if his memory needs refreshing the basic chapter contains several examples of these constructions. This can hardly be called a case of anticipation. The subject of prohibitions is said to be anticipated in § 81, but the subject under discussion is the hortatory subjunctive, and negative sentences of this character having the force of a prohibition are surely in place here. There is, then, no anticipation.

The reviewer objects to the postponement of noun constructions. The syntax of nouns has formed a large part of the instruction during the first year. On the other hand the syntax of verbs has been but begun and must be learned as rapidly as possible with the reading of Caesar. Even after Caesar is finished, most of the errors in Latin writing are in the verbs and not in the nouns. Verbs should, therefore, be attacked first and emphasized throughout the second year. No doubt opinions will differ as to what verb constructions should be taught with Caesar, but I venture the assertion that few will sympathize with the wholesale elimination which the reviewer proposes. Especially unwise would be the omission of the uses of the subjunctive in independent sentences, as these are basic in their character and the source of the subordinate constructions.

Part III is designedly based on parts of Cicero not ordinarily read in high schools. Possibly one-fifth of the words do not belong to a school vocabulary, but what other basic text outside the curriculum can be suggested in which four-fifths do so belong? A wrong impression is given as to the number of references in this Part. The reviewer should have stated that each exercise consists of two parts, either of which may be chosen. That reduces the number at least fifty per cent.

Space forbids a discussion of the other criticisms made, but perhaps enough has been said to show that their refutation would be equally easy. I wish to add that I believe that the reviewer wished to be candid and impartial. I regret that he did not succeed.

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGÉ

A History of Rome during the Later Republic and Early Principate. By A. H. J. Greenidge. Volume I: From the Tribune of Tiberius Gracchus to the Second Consulate of Marius, B. C. 133-104. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. (1905). Pp. xii + 508.

The intention was to cover in six volumes the period from the Gracchi to the accession of Vespasian; but the death of the author soon after the publication of the first volume has unfortunately left the work unfinished. It is reported that he had

made little preparation for the remaining volumes, and the American publishers are unable to say whether any effort is being made to carry forward the original plan.

The period of the Republic which Dr. Greenidge hoped to include has been more thoroughly treated than any other part of Roman history. For example, Long's *Decline of the Roman Republic* in five volumes is a close reproduction of the source material with brief comment on its value and meaning; Neumann's *Geschichte Roms während des Verfalles der Republik*, though partisan, is stimulating and suggestive; Drumann's *Geschichte Roms*, now being revised by Gröbe, is an aggregate of biographies of the contemporaries of Pompey and Caesar. The well known histories of Mommsen and Ihne and a multitude of biographical and more special works might also be mentioned. These studies of a most interesting age, undertaken from various points of view, have prepared the ground for a careful, detailed summing up of results, such as the history now under discussion was to be. Dr. Greenidge was well equipped for the task. His *Roman Public Life* and his *Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time* both show a scholarly mind and a familiarity with the constitution and laws of the later Republic essential to the historian of the period. Those who have known him through these works are pleasantly surprised to find in his *History*, in addition to scholarship, a considerable degree of insight into life and of dramatic power in the presentation of the great characters. It is true that the first chapter, which in a hundred pages discusses the social and economic conditions surrounding the Gracchi, is heavy and at times obscure; but the second chapter, which begins the narrative of the Gracchan reforms, awakens the interest of the reader; and the student of the period, on reaching the year 104 B. C., regretfully parts company with the author. A good quality is his use of nearly all the literary and epigraphic sources, which he cites in footnotes. In his interpretation of them he takes account of the various possibilities of meaning, and rarely if ever seems to strain a statement to fit it to a preconceived view.

In judging a work of this kind, based as it is at many points on scant and uncertain material, a wide margin must be left for difference of opinion. Mommsen, Ihne, and Ferrero agree in declaring the deposition of a tribune unconstitutional; although Dr. Greenidge admits that the ousting of Octavius was without direct precedent, he refuses to pronounce it illegal. Nearly the same disagreement exists regarding the immediate re-election of a tribune. In favor of our author it must be said that almost all the powers ever exercised by the Roman assembly had been gained in the way in

which Ti. Gracchus was attempting to establish its right to depose officials and to re-elect tribunes—by precedent rather than by law. These instances illustrate the author's willingness to defend the conduct of the Gracchi. Even the law of Gaius for the taxation of Asia is favorably judged. While recognizing the incompleteness of the reforms of the two brothers, he grows eloquent, as well he may, over their personal character and their influence on the future history of their country. Henceforth "at every turn in the paths of political life the statesman was confronted by two figures, whom fear or admiration raised to gigantic proportions". In brief the author's treatment of these reformers is unexcelled in depth and sympathy. Marius in earlier life he regards as an ideal soldier, a man of uncouth appearance, "but with a massive reserve of strength, a persistence not blindly obstinate, a patience that could wear out the most brilliant efforts of his rivals and opponents", in politics a Manius Curius brought down from the heroic age of the Samnite wars to repeat his life in a period of degeneracy. It would have been interesting to follow with Dr. Greenidge the later career of this remarkable man and especially to analyze his leadership of the great proletarian uprising.

Few errors can be found anywhere in the volume. "Enactment" on p. 202 is merely a verbal mistake for "bill". On p. 237 the author makes this statement in relation to the reformed comitia centuriata: "As the votes of each century were separately taken and proclaimed, the absolute majority required for the decisions of the assembly might be attained without the inferior orders being called on to express their judgment". This is a more serious mistake. That the centuries all voted and that the votes were all reported is proved by overwhelming evidence. The ideas expressed on pp. 116, 138 as to the connection of the imperium with the judicial function and the auspices are confused. If under the Sempronian agrarian law, as under the later Servilian rogation, the commissioners were of pretorian rank, they certainly had imperium; but they could have exercised jurisdiction without it. The right of Tiberius to the auspices was not inherent in the imperium, if he had it, but was granted him by a special article of his law (Cicero, *De Leg. Agr.* 2.12.31). Objection ought also to be made to his opinion on another constitutional point, repeated from his *Legal Procedure*. It is hardly possible, as the author assumes on p. 201, that C. Gracchus gave capital jurisdiction to the assembly of tribes. An occasional error or confusion in a relatively minor point, however, detracts little from the value of the work as a whole. It is in fact the most thorough treatment of the period covered; although not brill-

iant like Ferrero's *Greatness and Decline of Rome*, it is far more substantial. There can be no doubt that it will long maintain its place as the chief authority for the subject treated. All who rightly appreciate the excellence of the work achieved must deeply regret the author's untimely death.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD

A NEW CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity was organized on November 9 last, under most favorable auspices. Since Greater Pittsburgh has become a reality the word 'vicinity' in the title of the Association includes Western Pennsylvania and adjacent territory in Ohio and West Virginia.

The object of the Association is to develop a larger appreciation of classical literature, to encourage more efficient instruction, and to unify the interests of classical teachers.

The officers of the Association are as follows: President, H. S. Scribner, Western University of Pennsylvania; Vice-Presidents, A. A. Haye of Washington and Jefferson College and J. B. Hensch of Shadyside Academy, Pittsburgh; Secretary-Treasurer, Anna Petty, Carnegie High School, Carnegie, Pennsylvania.

At the meeting of November 23 Professor J. B. English, of Washington and Jefferson College, delivered an illustrated lecture on *The Roman Forum* in 1906. On January 11, 1908, the Association will be addressed by Professor W. A. Elliot, of Allegheny College, on *A Day at Old Troy*. The Association will hold six meetings a year. The outlook for its success is most hopeful.

CARNEGIE, PENN.

ANNA PETTY

A book not without interest to classical students is entitled *Source Book in Ancient Philosophy*, by Charles M. Bakewell, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907; pp. vii+395). The author has attempted to bring together translations in part original, in part borrowed, of the most significant documents bearing on the history of philosophy, and so to bring the student of philosophy into direct contact with the sources, so far as at least as that may be done through the medium of translations. Passages are given from a long array of philosophers, from Thales to Plotinus. To students of Lucretius and of Cicero's philosophical works who can not read Greek, the book is likely to prove decidedly useful. As the author notes, most of the sources from whom he quotes are already accessible in translation, but these translations are scattered through many volumes.

Mr. William Stearns Davis, whose book, *A Friend of Caesar*, attracted wide notice several years ago,

has turned his attention to ancient Greek life in a novel entitled, *A Victor of Salamis*, a tale of the days of Xerxes, Leonidas and Themistocles (The Macmillan Co., 1907). To criticise this as a novel is beyond the sphere of *The Classical Weekly*; to students of the Classics the book inevitably has interest in view of the important and fascinating period with which it deals. One thing the book does very well; it makes one feel, in some degree at least, the Greek horror of Medizing and Medizers.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

is published by The Classical Association of the Middle States and Maryland. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College (120th Street, West of Amsterdam Avenue), New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also subscription to *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*) are two dollars.

To persons outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* is one dollar per year. Single copies are 10 cents each.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College

ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

MITCHELL CARROLL, The George Washington University

Business Manager

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising should be sent to the business manager.

ROEHR PUBLISHING CO., PRINTERS
35 MYRTLE AVE., BROOKLYN

HOTEL MARLBOROUGH

36th Street and Broadway New York

The Famous German Restaurant. Broadway's Chief Attraction for Special Food Dishes and Popular Music.

SWEENEY, TIERNEY HOTEL CO. E. M. Tierney, Manager

TOURS AND TICKETS EVERYWHERE

Choice Staterooms by all Steamship Lines. Foreign Exchange. Travelers Checks. Correspondence invited. Tel. 1410 Stuyvesant.

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB CO.
25 Union Square, New York

A Ground-Floor Investment

Why be satisfied with four per cent. when you can make three or four times as much with us? Hundreds of teachers among our satisfied investors testify to splendid results. For a few weeks only we offer you the opportunity to join our company on the ground-floor by investing from \$100 up. The money is absolutely secured by valuable New York City real estate.

For particulars sign the attached coupon and send it to us to-day.

MCNEECE, KISTLER & COMPANY, 150 Nassau St., New York City

MR. P. P. EDSON,

Investment Department, Suite 804, 150 Nassau St., N.Y.

DEAR SIR—Without creating any obligations on my part, kindly send full particulars regarding the investment mentioned above.

Name.....

Address.....

The Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Series

Among the notable books of this remarkable series are:

INTRODUCTORY LATIN. By F. P. Moulton, of the High School, Hartford, Conn.	\$1.00
BEGINNING LATIN. By J. E. Barss, Latin Master, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.	1.00
WRITING LATIN. By J. E. Barss. Book 1	.50
Book 2	.75
CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR. By H. F. Towle and Paul R. Jenks. Books I-IV	1.00
Complete Edition	1.25
EXERCISE BOOKS ON CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR. By A. I. Dotey. Books II, III and IV, 20c each. Book I	.25
CICERO'S SIX ORATIONS. By R. W. Tunstall, Classical Master, Tome Institute, Md.	1.00
JUVENAL. By H. L. Wilson, Johns Hopkins University	1.25
LIVY, BOOKS I, XXI and XXII. By E. B. Lease, College of the City of New York	1.25
SELECTIONS FROM THE ELEGIAC POETS. By J. B. Carter, Director American School of Classical Studies, Rome	1.25
GILDERSLEEVE'S LATIN GRAMMAR. By B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, and Gonzalez Lodge, Columbia University	1.20

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

A Vest-Pocket Memory-Test Latin Word-List

All the words used in Caesar and in Cicero's orations over 15 times (2188) grouped according to frequency of occurrence, together with all the words not previously included used over 5 times in Caesar (400), Sallust (90), Nepos (20), and Virgil (Aen. 1-vi, 296), so arranged that the English meanings, which are on separate pages not visible at the same time, may be brought line for line into visible parallel columns by means of a simple folding device, (patented) by George H. Browne, A. M., The Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Mas

Bound durably in full leather for the pocket. List price, 75 cents.

Boston New York GINN & COMPANY Chicago London

THE FIRST YEAR OF LATIN

By Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley

Prepares the pupil directly for the reading of Caesar

CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR

By Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley

Contains all the text, grammar and composition for second year work

For full information, address

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
New York Boston Chicago

FIRST BOOK IN LATIN

By Alexander James Inglis, Instructor in Latin, Horace Mann High School, and Virgil Prettyman, Principal Horace Mann High School, Teachers College.

REVISED EDITION

12 mo. cloth, 301 pages, 90 cents net.

Provides for the first year student of Latin an adequate preparation for the reading of Caesar.

The Macmillan Company, 64-66 Fifth Ave., New York City

First Year Latin

Do you want your first year's work to prepare your students to read Caesar? If so, write us for a description of our beginner's book, *Bellum Helveticum* by Messrs. Jones and Jenks. It is used by more first year students in Greater New York than is any other one book.

SCOTT, FORESMAN & CO.
378 Wabash Avenue Chicago

Benner & Smyth's Beginner's Greek Book \$1.25

I had thought we had reached the limit of excellence in first books in Greek. I heartily approve of the eliminating process, however, and I recommend Benner and Smyth's Beginner's Greek Book for the use of beginners without hesitation.—R. F. YOUNGMAN, Instructor in Greek, Lafayette College.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

100 Washington Square

New York City

Siegel Cooper Co.

The Best Known and Most Popular Retail Store in the United States

If you have any doubt of the accuracy of that claim it proves that you are not in the habit of coming here.

We urge you to make our acquaintance. When you do, you'll find out the reasons that have made this store FIRST in popularity and volume of business. They are reasons that affect you directly and economically, and you will be glad you came.

Siegel, Cooper & Co., Bankers, have a location in this store.

They offer conveniences for holders of small accounts not usually found in other banks.

On time deposits they pay four per cent. interest.

They pay two per cent. interest on accounts subject to check.

They are the largest distributors of "Home Safes" for the encouragement of economy in expenditure and the aggregation of small amounts.

Teachers' checks cashed. Accounts with teachers are solicited.

Hours 9 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.

Sixth Avenue, 18th to 19th Streets
NEW YORK CITY